

In the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1, 2 and 3. Annotated sheets showing the changes are attached. The replacement sheets contain the words “Prior Art” and replace the originally filed sheets.

REMARKS

Figs. 1, 2, and 3 have been amended as required. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is requested. The abstract has also been amended. However, the word “namo” does not appear in the application as filed, and is spelled correctly on line 9 of page 15 of the specification.

Applicants acknowledge that this application was filed with incorrect claim numbering, in that claim 11 was inadvertently numbered claim 12. In this amendment, claim 12 has been renumbered as claim 11.

The phrase “in response to the coordinate at which” in claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9 and 10 has been changed to “with reference to the coordinate at which”, to address the claim objection in paragraph 8 of the Office Action, and the §112 rejection in paragraph 12 of the Office Action.

In response to paragraph 10, the term “attribute” is more clearly defined in paragraph 8 of the published application (page 2, line 17 of the specification), without adding new matter.

Claims 1-10 and 12 have been amended to overcome the §101 rejection in paragraph 11 of the Office Action, by amending the preambles of the rejected claims to recite, for example, an emulation program which causes a client computer to perform the steps recited in the claims. Applicants submit that these amendments overcome the §101 rejection, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal.

The claims have been amended to overcome the §112 rejections in paragraph 13 of the Office Action, without narrowing the scope of the claims. The amendments are believed to be self explanatory, but the Examiner should call Applicants' attorney if a detailed explanation would expedite prosecution. Accordingly, withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under §102 on the basis of Brooks '607. The claims have not been narrowed to overcome this rejection, and Applicants traverse for the following reasons.

Brooks discloses a method to convert character-base screen data (CUI data) received from a host computer into graphical-base screen data (GUI data). Specifically, Brooks converts the character-base screen data for a plurality of pages into graphical-base screen data for one page. However, Brooks aims to convert all the functions and options of the character-base application into pull-down menus of the graphical-base screen, which is different from generating GUI screen data based on the CUI screen data (coordinate, character, attribute) according to the present invention.

Further, Brooks does not disclose the correction of GUI screen data with reference to the coordinate, as presently claimed. The Examiner refers to the underline and bold/reverse color row as the correction. However, the underline shows an initial short-cut command, and the bold/reverse color shows a selected row (a target to be processed), which is different from the correction of GUI screen data. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner should call Applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

January 18, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\1118\68793\B38405.DOC



FIG.1

Prior Art




FIG.2

Precise ART




FIG.3

Prior Art

